



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Everling, and Jagić. Here I think we shall have to go beyond Schürer, however willing one may otherwise be to yield to his judgment.

The page numbers of the second edition are added in the third, so that older citations of Schürer can be found as readily as ever.

CARL CLEMEN.

HALLE, AN DER S.,
Germany.

THE COPTIC VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, IN THE NORTHERN DIALECT, otherwise called Memphitic or Bohairic. With Introduction, Critical Apparatus, and Literal English Translation. 2 vols., 8vo. Vol. I, Matthew and Mark; pp. cxlvi + 484. Vol II, Luke and John; pp. 584. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: H. Frowde, 1898. 42s.

THE Bohairic version, as its name shows, was originally the version of the northern province of Egypt, which extends from Alexandria to Cairo, with Alexandria, or rather the neighboring monasteries of Nitria, as a center of radiation; for there was the residence of the patriarchs of Alexandria until the tenth century, when, for political reasons, it was removed to Cairo. South of Cairo other versions obtained, called Sahidic, Middle Egyptian, etc., from the respective dialects in which they were written. These versions were apparently made from Greek recensions, different from that which underlies the Bohairic version. Here we are concerned with the latter only. The others have not yet received much attention on the part of New Testament critics, chiefly owing to their fragmentary condition, as also to the fact that they have not yet been critically edited. The importance of the Bohairic version of the gospels for textual criticism has long been recognized; its presumed high antiquity and its relative purity having early attracted attention to it.

From Mill to Tischendorf and Gregory, textual critics have gathered carefully what they could of the variant readings of the Bohairic version, and given them a prominent part in the critical apparatus of their editions; the task, however, was arduous, owing to the scarcity of Coptic scholars in the theological schools. The best critics were all ignorant of the Coptic language, and had to depend on occasional private information furnished them by Coptic scholars, or on the two rather unsatisfactory editions of Wilkins and Schwarze. Wilkins omitted to give us the variant readings of the many manuscripts from which he obtained his text, while Schwarze limited himself to one good manuscript

and two valueless transcripts by a European hand; apparently not caring what text he gave us. Furthermore, both Wilkins and Schwarze, the latter especially, indulged in disproportionate comparison of their text with the Greek; a task of secondary importance, which they discharged, moreover, in a most uncritical manner. What the textual critic expected from the Coptic scholar was, first, a Coptic text with full critical apparatus embracing the variant readings of all the best Coptic manuscripts previously described and classified; and, secondly, a faithful translation of that text; as for the comparison with the Greek, he could do it himself, although short references to the critical apparatus of a standard Greek edition would have been of no little assistance to him. Imperfect as these two editions were, they nevertheless furnished the textual critic with a number of interesting variant readings, which confirmed scholars in their appreciation of the Bohairic rendering of the gospels, and made them long for a third and better edition that would acquaint them accurately with all its peculiarities. That edition we are glad to welcome in the two volumes just edited by Rev. G. Horner.

The editor adopted the text of Codex Huntington 17 of the Bodleian Library, Oxford (A), without attempt at emendation, which, as he modestly puts it, he did in deference to the opinions of Professors Ignazio Guidi, Ludwig Stern, and the late Professor de Lagarde, who considered that manuscript as the best and most authoritative witness of the ancient Bohairic text;¹ the last-mentioned scholar even deprecated as useless the expenditure of time in the collation of other manuscripts. Yet, to preclude every possible doubt on the part of those for whose profit his publication was intended, Mr. Horner bravely undertook to gather all the variant readings he could from the other manuscripts—forty-six in all—a most delicate and difficult task, if we consider that those manuscripts are scattered all over Europe, while some are preserved in the distant churches and monasteries of Egypt. This thorough collation, we are glad to say, showed more than a purely negative result; it brought to light the fact “that the printed Bodleian text is not alone in its purity, but, while exhibiting more important omissions than other manuscripts, contains additions absent from two others (C & H) which may be classed with it.” It furthermore enables us to trace to their origin most of the corruptions and corrections of the Bohairic version, not to mention the light it casts on the character of the Arabic versions, or, rather, versions to be found in

¹ This MS., dated A. D. 1174, is the oldest known MS. of the Bohairic version.

many manuscripts along with the Coptic text, of which they seem to be entirely independent. The comparison between the Coptic and the Greek has been brought in only in the measure necessary to guide scholars by referring them briefly to different groups of Greek manuscripts, as marked in the standard eighth edition of Tischendorf. Here, however, we must observe that Mr. Horner's apparatus is practically of no use to scholars who have not at least an elementary knowledge of Coptic. It would have taken but very little to make it available even to those (and they are, unfortunately, too many) who are entirely ignorant of that language. Let us take an example. Matt. 14:16a reads thus: *ñθof de pejaf je seerxria an ñtouše ñðou* (text), *and he said they have not need to go* (translation). The apparatus has: *ñθof de]* conforming to Greek Ν* D 61 syr^{cu}, etc.: om. *de* F1. 2*; translation of E1 has *واته* *and he indeed* and gloss *الرومي* *ان يسوع* *the Greek has "and Jesus indeed."* *Pejaf]* ABCsHΘJ LNO conforming to a b ff² k q arm: + *ñðou*, Γ D1-2 Δ E F G1 K conforming to Greek. One who knows Coptic has no trouble at all in understanding the apparatus, provided, of course, he has before him a copy of Gregory's edition. Not so the layman; it is only by long and careful comparison between the apparatus of Mr. Horner and that of Tischendorf-Gregory that he will be able to make out that *ñθof* must correspond to *ὁ*, *pejaf* to *εἰπεν*, *ñðou* to *αὐτοῖς*, etc., a difficulty which would have been avoided by inserting the Greek equivalent after the Coptic word on which the apparatus bears. We may further observe that it would have greatly relieved the memory of the reader, or at any rate spared him considerable loss of time, to find a summary of the *sigla* or letters of the Coptic MSS., similar to the one printed in Gregory's work immediately before the gospel of Matthew, along with a copy of that same summary of Gregory, for the *sigla* of the Greek MSS. occurring in Mr. Horner's own apparatus. One could thus easily find one's way through the labyrinth of the apparatus without having to refer to the lengthy descriptions of the MSS. in Mr. Horner's work, or to the standard Greek edition.

The description of the MSS. is one of the best features of Mr. Horner's work; at any rate it is *unique* in the history of Coptic biblical criticism. Not only does it contain everything that is necessary to acquaint us with the origin, age, school of every one of the MSS., but from a palæographical point of view it is so exhaustive and detailed that anyone who has ever so little knowledge of the Coptic script

gains the impression of seeing with his own eyes and handling with his own hands the manuscripts themselves. It is one of the best contributions ever made to Coptic palæography.

"The object of the translation," says Mr. Horner, "is to supply the English reader with some knowledge of the Greek text which was translated by the Egyptians of the northwestern province, whose dialect has survived to the present day in the liturgical books of the Coptic church. This being the main object, it is also intended by literal treatment to give an idea of the peculiarities of the language and the method of the version." To fulfil this double object Mr. Horner took a great deal of pains and followed a strictly consistent method, endeavoring to use constantly the same English rendering for the same Greek word, and to maintain the Coptic order of words. In this attempt he has been successful, we are glad to say, in so far at least as the very different genius of the Coptic and English languages permitted; and there is no doubt that his translation will prove interesting, nay useful, to the average intelligent clergyman who wants to know what the general drift of the Coptic version is, and consequently is satisfied with a literal rendering of the text of the chief manuscript.

It seems to me, however, that the same object could have been attained more fully by adopting the Greek language instead of the English. Greek is known to all scholars interested in New Testament criticism, and it has long been demonstrated that no language is more fit to render Coptic than Greek, the latter having so strongly influenced the syntax of the former. With a Greek translation and the Greek equivalent of the Coptic word, to which the apparatus refers, as we said above, this whole apparatus would have been serviceable to all scholars, whether acquainted with Coptic or not.

This, however, and other similar remarks I have made in criticism of the book are intended to guide the student in his use of this valuable book, not to lessen his confidence in it. The book was written primarily for the professional textual critics, who are not afraid of purchasing independence at the cost of having to master a few oriental languages, and these, I think, can find with the book no fault which they cannot remedy themselves with but little trouble. As for the others—well, it may be they are not as exacting as I suppose they might be; they must know that they have no right to expect others to do more than to facilitate their own work.

In closing we heartily congratulate Mr. Horner on his conscientious and scholarly work, and also thank the delegates of the

Clarendon Press for that new token of their well-known traditional zeal for the furtherance of the study of the Coptic versions. We hope they will hasten the publication of the rest of that Bohairic version of the New Testament, and intrust it to the same hand which so ably edited the gospels.

H. HYVERNAT.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C.

DIE PARUSIE CHRISTI. Von HEINRICH DIECKMANN, Pastor.
Geestemünde: J. H. Henke, 1898. Pp. vi + 78. M. 1.20.

THE book leaves a favorable impression by its fulness, conciseness, and candor. It discusses first the apostolic views concerning the parousia, and then works back to the teachings of Jesus. In the apostolic literature, not excluding the Johannean books, the hope of Christ's personal return is universal; the day of the coming is everywhere conceived as a single and definite point of time that is near at hand; almost everywhere it is apparent that this day was expected during the life of that generation, though a definite fixing of the time was regarded as impossible and unwarranted. With the query whether this universal belief of the church could have been based on a universal misunderstanding of Jesus, the author passes to the main portion of his investigation, the teaching of Jesus concerning the purpose, manner, and time of his coming. The last point is, of course, the most difficult one. His results on the bulk of the passages are as follows: (1) Jesus neither identifies nor combines his parousia with the destruction of Jerusalem; (2) for the latter catastrophe he fixes a definite term, the life of that generation; (3) concerning the time of the parousia Jesus denies that he has any knowledge; (4) he repeatedly and emphatically contradicts the lively expectation of the people and the disciples that the kingdom would shortly be set up; (5) he teaches an era of development which presupposes a long space of time before the parousia. The author frankly acknowledges that there are a few passages which do not harmonize with the first three statements, but fix the parousia in the near future. He refuses to believe in the errancy of Christ, and explains the difficulty by the supposition that the disciples did not fully understand Jesus, but under the pressure of contemporary eschatological expectations transferred to the parousia what Jesus said of the near destruction of Jerusalem. They changed